

**REMARKS*****Response to Arguments***

Applicants acknowledge the new grounds for rejection provided in the examiner's letter of March 31, 2006. The amendments submitted herewith are believed fully responsive to the examiner's remarks and therefore place the application in condition for allowance.

***Drawings***

Through an informality the specification incorrectly referred to element 2126 of Figure 21 by "2116". Paragraph 0071 of the specification is hereby amended to correctly refer to the oxide element 2126 illustrated in Figure 21 and described with specificity in the specification. This amendment is not believed to introduce new matter, and the specification and figures are now believed to be in condition for allowance.

***Claims Rejections - 35 USC §112***

Claims 19, 20, 39, 40, 51, 52, 63 and 64 stand rejected under 35 USC 112, first paragraph. These claims are all canceled, and this rejection is believed to be moot.

***Claims Rejections - 35 USC §103***

Claims 7 and 46 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Manning et al (US. Pat. No. 5,232,865). Claim 7 has been canceled. Claim 46 has been amended to incorporate subject matter deemed allowable by the examiner in his letter of March 31, 2006 as described below, and amended claim 46 is thus believed allowable over Manning et al, as more fully explained below.

Claims 27 and 58 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Manning et al (US. Pat. No. 5,232,865). Claim 27 has been canceled. Claim 58 has been amended to incorporate subject matter deemed allowable by the examiner in his letter of March 31, 2006 as described below, and amended claim 58 is thus believed allowable over Manning et al, as more fully explained below.

*Allowable Subject Matter*

Applicants note with gratitude the examiner's allowance of claims 4-6, 12, 13, 14, 17, 18, 24-26, 32-34, 37, 38, 41-45, 47-50, 53-57, and 59-62.

In his letter of March 31, 2006, the examiner states that claims 8-11 and 28-31 are objected to as "dependent upon a rejected base claim," (claims 7 and 27, respectively), "but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims".

Claims 8-11 were each directly or indirectly dependent upon base independent claim 7. The present amendment cancels claim 7 and amends claims 8-11 to include all of the limitations of base claim 7 and any intervening claims. Specifically, claim 8 was directly dependent upon claim 7; claim 8 has been rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of claim 7, and amended claim 8 is now believed to be allowable. Claim 9 is directly dependent upon amended claim 8, and thereby incorporates all of the limitations of amended claim 8; Claim 9 is therefore also believed to be allowable. Claim 10 was directly dependent upon claim 7; claim 10 has been rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of claim 7, and amended claim 10 is now believed to be allowable. Claim 11 is directly dependent upon amended claim 10, and thereby incorporates all of the limitations of amended claim 10; claim 11 is therefore also believed to be allowable.

Additionally, claim 46 stands rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Manning et al. Claim 46 was directly dependent upon claim 7, and is presently amended to depend instead upon amended claim 8; amended claim 46 now incorporates subject matter deemed allowable as described above, and amended claim 46 is thus now believed allowable over Manning et al.

Claims 28-31 were each directly or indirectly dependent upon base independent claim 27. The present amendment cancels claim 27 and amends claims 28-31 to include all of the limitations of base claim 27 and any intervening claims. Specifically, claim 28 was directly dependent upon claim 27; claim 28 has been rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of claim 27, and amended claim 28 is now believed to be allowable. Claim 29 is directly dependent upon amended claim 28, and thereby incorporates all of the limitations of amended claim 28; claim 29 is therefore also

believed to be allowable. Claim 30 was directly dependent upon claim 27; claim 30 has been rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of claim 27, and amended claim 30 is now believed to be allowable. Claim 31 is directly dependent upon amended claim 30, and thereby incorporates all of the limitations of amended claim 30; claim 31 is therefore also believed to be allowable.

Additionally, claim 58 stands rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Manning et al. Claim 58 was directly dependent upon claim 27, and is presently amended to depend instead upon amended claim 28; amended claim 58 now incorporates subject matter deemed allowable as described above, and amended claim 58 is thus now believed allowable over Manning et al.

#### *Conclusion*

It is believed that with the entry of the present amendment claims 4-6, 8-14, 17, 18, 24-26, 28-34, 37, 38, 41-50, and 53-62 are all now in condition for allowance pursuant to the examiner's comments in his letter of March 31, 2006, and early notification is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date:

June 27, 2006

PJD:cg

By:

Patrick J. Daugherty

CUSTOMER NO. 26679